

other cases will be excluded. The clause as it stands reads :

“For the removal of doubts it is hereby declared that any functions exercised by the Mysore Board of Revenue under any law specified in section 4,...

If we retain this wording then the saving will be confined only to the laws specified in section 4. The idea is to cover all the cases which were tried by the Revenue Board in the past. Therefore, I accept the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“In clause 13 the words and figure “specified in section 4” occurring in line 3 shall be deleted.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That clause 13, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 13, as amended, was added to the Bill.

5 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri M. P. PATIL.—Sir, I beg to move :

“That the Mysore Revenue Appellate Tribunal Bill, 1957, as amended, be passed.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That the Mysore Revenue Appellate Tribunal Bill, 1957, as amended, be passed.”

The motion was adopted.

MYSORE ANATOMY BILL, 1957

Motion to consider.

Sri V. VENKATAPPA (Minister for Education).—I beg to move :

“That the Mysore Anatomy Bill, 1957, be taken into consideration.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

“That the Mysore Anatomy Bill, 1957, be taken into consideration”

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ವೆಂಕಟಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಮನೂದೆಯ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಯಾರೊಬ್ಬರ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇರಲಾರದೆಂದು ನಾನು ಅಂದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಾದಂಥ ಮನೂದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ಆಕ್ಟ್ ಜಾರಿಯಲ್ಲರಲ್ಲ. ಅದರ ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ನಮಗೆ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಸೇರಿರತಕ್ಕ ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಕನ್ನಡ ಭಾಗಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿಯ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನು ಜಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಇದರ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಕಂಡು ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ತಾವುಗಳೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಈ ಮನೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೀರೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

*Dr. T. PARTHASARATHY (Mallawaram).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I welcome this Bill though I am on the opposite side because our institutions who carry out this scientific work are finding it very difficult without an enactment like this. It is a great problem to obtain such bodies and I personally know that we had to wait for several weeks to get a part dissected. I would like to suggest to the Hon'ble Minister to include a clause in this Bill making provision to accept voluntary donation of a dead body during the person's life-time. It is done in Western countries. A person donates his body after death for the growth of scientific knowledge. There is no similar provision here.

The second thing I would like to bring to the notice of the Hon'ble Minister is that nothing has been provided here regarding the disposal of the remnants of the body. I have observed that remnants of the dead bodies are cremated in a very ugly manner. Provision must be made here or at least instructions must be issued to the concerned for the disposal of the remnants and they must be given a dignified burial as the ill-fated would have enabled the growth of scientific knowledge. Then, the transfer of a dead body from the place where it is

(DR. T. PARTHASARATHY)

found to the place of the institution should be in a dignified way. I have found that they are carried in open carts which are used to carry fire wood. I would like that these bodies which would help the advancement of science and betterment of the knowledge of the students are carried in a very dignified way. I want an enactment framed for this purpose or instructions be issued in this behalf. Also, the institution which claim these bodies for the use of dissection and such other purposes which are only for the benefit of scientific knowledge, should be correctly instructed not to expose these bodies to the public. Whenever any concerned person claims it, it may be allowed so that the dignity of the dead body may be preserved. The students may be allowed to make use of the body to the fullest extent. In the Bill it is said that this shall come into force at once in the South Kanara District. I am surprised to see this difference in the enforcement of law. I think, it should come into force at once throughout the State, because, an enactment is an enactment which should not be divided from area to area. There is not much for me to comment, but I would like the Hon'ble Minister to add some of these things.

A MEMBER.—You could have moved an amendment.

DR. T. PARTHASARATHY.—Because amendments moved from this side will not be accepted, I did not think of doing so. (*laughter*). So, amendments may be moved from the other side so that they may be included for the use of the public.

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That the Mysore Anatomy Bill, 1957, be considered.”

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER.—There is an amendment to clause 4.

SRI J. H. SHAMSUDDIN (Honawar).—I am not moving it. In the prescribed rules, the sentiments may be carried out.

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That Clauses 2 to 5, both inclusive, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

“Clauses 2 to 5, both inclusive, were added to the Bill.”

MR. SPEAKER.—Clause 6.

SRI J. H. SHAMSUDDIN.—I beg to move :

‘That the words “provided that such fine shall in no case be less than two hundred rupees” shall be deleted.’

MR. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

‘That the words “provided that such fine shall in no case be less than two hundred rupees” shall be deleted.’

SRI V. VENKATAPPA.—I accept the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is :

‘That the words “provided that such fine shall in no case be less than two hundred rupees” shall be deleted.’

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That Clause 6, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 6, as amended, was added to the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER.—Clauses 7 to 10. The question is :

“That Clauses 7 to 10, both inclusive, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 7 to 10, both inclusive, were added to the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER.—Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble. The question is :

“That Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble were added of the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri V. VENKATAPPA.—Sir, I beg to move :

“That the Mysore Anatomy Bill, 1957, as amended, be passed.”

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is :

“That the Mysore Anatomy Bill, 1957, as amended, be passed.”

The motion was adopted.

MYSORE MOTOR VEHICLES TAXATION BILL, 1957.

Motion to consider.

Sri C. M. POONACHA (Minister for Home Affairs).—Sir, I beg to move :

“That the Mysore Motor Vehicles Taxation Bill, 1957, be taken into consideration.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

“That the Mysore Motor Vehicles Taxation Bill, 1957, be taken into consideration.”

***Sri C. M. POONACHA.**—Sir, in moving the Bill for the consideration of the House, I have not much to add except to state that this measure has been brought before this House for consideration with a view to bring about a uniform pattern of motor vehicle taxation for the new State of Mysore. We have for the different integrating areas different taxation Acts in force and that is causing considerable difficulty to vehicle owners and also to transport operators. With that end in view, this Bill has been framed in such a way as to include the most salient parts of the different taxation Acts that were in force in the integrating areas.

The main features of this Bill is indicated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. The Bill envisages the abolition of municipal tolls all over the State. Hitherto, in some areas the practice of collecting tolls on motor vehicles in municipal limits is in force and hereafter it is proposed to do away with the imposition of such municipal levies. A second feature of the Bill is

that it proposes to exempt from payment of tax motor vehicles used solely for agricultural purposes. Further, it also proposes to prohibit local bodies from levying tax or tolls on motor vehicles and provides for payment of compensation for loss of such income to the local bodies, whether municipalities or local bodies as the case may be. In the financial memorandum that is attached, the financial aspects have also been examined and the probable income that could be collected under this taxation measure is also broadly indicated.

Sir, I for one think that there would not be much of a controversy in accepting this Bill. However, this Bill is now placed before the House for its consideration and I rise to commend that the Bill be taken for consideration.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—Sir, while introducing this bill, the Hon'ble Home Minister was pleased to say that it would be non-controversial. I am sorry he has misread the situation in the House as well as outside. If he has just cared to look into the number of memoranda that he received, he would have disabused himself of any such illusion. But unfortunately since he still seems to suffer from the illusion that this Bill is non-controversial, I must place some facts to prove that it could not be considered so non-controversial. Even from the point of view of the interests of the constituency which he represents, it should be considered controversial, for the simple and obvious reason that the level of tax proposed in so far as the area from which the Hon'ble Minister hails, is nearly four to five times the tax that he had chosen to levy while he was Chief Minister of Coorg.

Sir, I beg to place a few comments which are in the nature of opposition to some aspects of the Bill. While saying this, I do not want to say that there should be no tax on motor vehicles at all. My point is simple it is that the principle of uniformity has been seized with a view to increase the levy on motor vehicles all over the State, whether in old Mysore or in the integrating areas. I am sure that while